pears possible that when a minimal quantity of strychnine is employed the reactions described will be found to be confined to the ipsilateral hind leg. Together with the hind limb phenomena just described there is usually to be noted a rigidity affecting both forelimbs, which again strongly recalls the appearances of decerebrate rigidity.

The reactions above depicted do not appear to be due to an action of the strychnine on the spinal cord and bulb, since the symptoms are confined to the hind and forelimbs. Vigorous stimulation of other parts of the body, *i. e.*, the trunk and head elicits not the slightest indication of strychnine convulsions. There is no opisthotonus; the lower jaw is constantly relaxed and the mouth open.

Magnini and Beck and Bikeles had previously applied a solution of strychnine to the cerebellar cortex for the purpose of localization. The effects described by these authors were, however, of an indefinite character and involved widely-separated regions of the body. According to Luciani the reactions were in part due to diffusion of the drug to the medulla oblongata and the observations of the writers cited lend no support to the doctrine of cerebellar localization. In my experiments, on the contrary, precautions were taken to prevent spread of the drug to the medulla oblongata and the symptoms themselves were of a definite and restricted nature. My experiments are being continued on the cat and the method will be extended to the study of the cerebellum of the dog, monkey and other animals.

Frederick R Miller

Western University Medical School,
London, Canada,
March 22, 1920

A LOGIC TEST

To the Editor of Science: I have lately came upon what I regard as the very best Logic-Puzzle that I have ever met with; that it is good is proved by the fact that the people I have put it to have been somewhat equally divided as to whether they answer yes or no to the question involved. Moreover, it is an actual case—a real advertisement of a clothing store that I had the good luck to find in a recent newspaper. This is it:

> We have all known from our youth up that to err is human. If this is so, it must be that all of our competitors are thoroughly human.

The implication is, of course, that "our competitors" are people who make (in their cutting and fitting) plenty of errors, and the inference drawn is that this proves them to be human. Now this is either good reasoning or bad; which is it?

I should be extremely glad to receive answers to this question, and especially if they are accompanied with the grounds for the answer—yes or no.

Christine Ladd-Franklin

Columbia University,
March 2, 1920

THE SITUATION OF SCIENTIFIC MEN IN RUSSIA

A recent letter to Science (March 26, 1920, p. 322) having brought up the question of "the situation of scientific men in Russia," with particular reference to Professor Pavlov, it seems fitting to publish the following letter from Professor Boris Babkin, who was for many years assistant to Professor Pavlov. We are all interested in the welfare of our scientific colleagues in Russia as well as in other countries, and this direct statement may throw some light on the situation.

H. Gideon Wells

The Otho A. Sprague Memorial Institute,
Chicago, Ill.,
April 5, 1920

Dec. 17, 1919.

Physiological Laboratory,
University of Odessa.

Dear Professor Wells,

I take advantage of my old acquaintance with you in E. Fischer's laboratory and beg you to assist me in the following matter.

The bolshevik revolution has brought Russia into such a state that not only has scientific work come to a standstill, but even our lives are in danger. Many professors have been put to death, many are in prison. I consider it necessary to continue my scientific activity. I therefore beg you to help me